

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 11 have been amended. No claims have been canceled. No new claims have been added. Claims 1-9 and 11 are pending. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the original claims and other claims in this application and in other applications.

Applicants' representative is grateful for the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 5-6.

Claims 1-4, 7-9, and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Thomas (U.S. Patent No. 4,263,504). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites, a two-dimensional dot code comprising "a plurality of dots printed by a printer on an arrangement of blocks on a printing medium." According to claim 1, "said dots are arranged in rows and columns on a basis of a pitch twice as large as printing resolution of said printer in at least rows or columns." Applicants respectfully submit that Thomas fails to disclose the claim 1 invention.

Thomas discloses a high density dot matrix code which can be used to represent characters digitally by regularly and evenly spaced parallel columns of dots and where binary information can be conveyed by the presence of absence of a dot at specific locations of the printed material. Column 4, lines 29-35. Specifically, Thomas teaches in column 7, lines 56-58, "[f]or example, the spacing or distance between dots, as represented by "a" and by "b" may be reduced to zero." (emphasis added). Applicants respectfully submit that this is different from "a pitch twice as large as printing resolution" as is recited in claim.

The Office Action states that Figs. 1A and 1B of Thomas illustrate a dot code in which adjacent columns are printed at twice the column pitch. Applicants respectfully traverse this argument. Thomas indicates in column 7, lines 52-56, that the dot pitch referred to by the Office Action is employed merely for convenience of illustration of the drawings. Thus, although Fig. 1A of Thomas appears to show that the dot pitch in the lateral direction is approximately twice as large as the dot diameter, this apparent dot pitch is not for the dots actually printed; instead, the dots relied upon in the Office Action are used to aid in the illustration of the Thomas invention (i.e., dot spacing, and missing dots, etc.). Applicants respectfully submit that each dot code disclosed and suggested in Thomas does not illustrate dots which are printed with a column pitch and a row pitch that are twice that of the printer resolution.

That is, Thomas fails to disclose or suggest a dot code wherein "said dots are arranged in rows and columns on a basis of a pitch twice as large as printing resolution of said printer in at least rows or columns." Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is believed to be allowable over the prior art of record. Depending claims 2-4 and 7-9 are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 11 recites a dot code comprising "a plurality of dots printed by a printer, to represent a predetermined code, on an arrangement of blocks printed on a printing medium, wherein said dots are arranged in rows and columns and are arranged on the basis of a pitch twice as large as print resolution of said print in at least rows or columns." Applicants respectfully submit that claim 11 is allowable over Thomas for at least for the reasons set forth above and on its own merits.

The rejection should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: August 12, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Thomas J. D'Amico

Registration No.: 28,371

Gianni Minutoli

Registration No.: 41,198

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
OSHINSKY LLP

2101 L Street NW

Washington, DC 20037-1526

(202) 785-9700

Attorneys for Applicant